

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is submitted to accompany a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) also filed on November 15, 2004. This Amendment and associated RCE is submitted in response to the Final Office Action dated August 13, 2004. Further,
5 this Amendment and associated RCE is provided within the three month period for response to the Final Office Action extending to November 15, 2004. Please note that since November 13, 2004, falls on a Saturday, the three month period for response to the Final Office Action extends to Monday, November 15, 2004.

The current status of the claims are summarized below.

10 Claims 19-20 and 29 are currently amended.

Claims 34-36 are new.

Claims 19-36 are pending in the application after entry of the present Amendment.

New Claims

15 Claims 34-36 are new in the present Amendment. The Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 34-36 is patentable in view of the cited art of record.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 19-20 and 27-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being
20 anticipated by Trueblood (U.S. Patent No. 5,748,189). These rejections are traversed.

Trueblood discloses a method and apparatus for using a single keyboard and/or mouse in multi-screen operation with a multiplicity of independent display devices. Each display device is driven by separate driver software, such as X-server software. A software construct defines transition boundaries between the various display devices. As
25 the mouse cursor reaches a transition boundary, the mouse cursor disappears from its

current display device and appears in an adjacent display device according to a definition of the transition boundary. The keyboard follows the mouse such that the mouse operation affects the screen and work station associated with the display device upon which the mouse currently appears.

5 According to Trueblood, each of a number of client programs registers with one or more X-servers. Each X-server is a piece of software which receives commands and issues events in the X-Window protocol and language. The X-server is responsible for converting cursor movement data into a form suitable for graphic controller cards for causing a display device to generate a particular display. Thus, the X-server to which a
10 particular client program is registered is responsible for receiving and communicating cursor movement data to the particular client program. It should be understood that the X-server is a piece of software, as opposed to a server computer system.

 With respect to claim 19, a first server computer system is identified as being connected with a secondary Human Interface Device (HID). Also, a second server
15 computer system is determined to be providing a first part of an active session to a primary HID. The method of claim 19 further includes determining whether the first server computer system associated with the secondary HID is the same as the second server computer system associated with the primary HID. If the first and second server computer systems are not the same, the method of claim 19 requires that the connection
20 of the secondary HID be redirected from the first server computer system to the second server computer system, thus causing the second server computer system to be connected to both the primary and secondary HID. Then, the second server computer system provides the first and second parts of the active session for display on the primary HID and secondary HID, respectively.

The Office has asserted that Trueblood (column 8, lines 58-62) teaches "redirecting said connection of said secondary Human Interface Device to said second server computer system, if said first and second server computer systems are not the same server computer system." Trueblood (column 8, lines 58-62) teaches that "The peripheral
5 manager sends the keyboard and mouse data received through the operating system layer 60 to the X-server 70 or 72 associated with the display 62 or 64 upon which the mouse cursor currently appears and does not send such events to any other X-servers."

The Applicants respectfully disagree with above-mentioned assertion by the Office. More specifically, Trueblood does not teach redirection of a Human Interface
10 Device connection from a first server computer system to a second server computer system. The disclosure of Trueblood is directed to X-server software, not server computer systems. Thus, the referenced teaching of Trueblood is silent with respect to redirecting connections between a Human Interface Device and a server computer system.

Additionally, Trueblood teaches that an X-server associated with the display in
15 which the cursor currently appears is to receive keyboard and mouse (Human Interface Device) data, and that no other X-server is to receive keyboard and mouse data. Thus, according to Trueblood, as the mouse is moved from a first display to a second display, receipt of the keyboard and mouse data will transition from the X-server associated with the first display to the X-server associated with the second display. It should be
20 appreciated that the X-server associated with the first display must remain in communication with the first display in order to handle an event in which the mouse enters the first display. Similarly, the X-server associated with the second display must remain in communication with the second display in order to handle an event in which the mouse enters the second display. Consequently, even considering the
25 misinterpretation of the X-server of Trueblood as being equivalent to the server computer

system of claim 19, Trueblood clearly does not teach redirecting the connection of the secondary HID to the server computer system associated with the primary HID. For example, if the second display associated with the second X-server were redirected to the first X-server, the second X-server would not be able to handle the event in which the
5 mouse enters the second display.

For a claim to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each and every feature of the claim must be disclosed by a single prior art reference. For at least the reasons discussed above, the Applicants submit that the Trueblood reference does not disclose each and every feature of claim 19, as required for anticipation of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

10 Therefore, the Applicants submit that independent claim 19 is patentable over the cited art of record. Additionally, since each of claims 20 and 27-33 ultimately depends from claim 19, the Applicants submit that each of claims 20 and 27-33 is patentable for at least the same reasons provided for claim 19.

15 **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 21-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Trueblood in view of Berkowitz et al. ("Berkowitz") (U.S. Patent No. 5,392,400). These rejections are traversed.

Since each of claims 21-26 depends from claim 19, each of claims 21-26
20 incorporates all the features of claim 19. Therefore, the Applicants submit that each of claims 21-26 is patentable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons previously discussed with respect to claim 19.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants kindly request that the Office withdraw the rejections of claims 19-33. The Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims (19-36) are in condition for allowance. Therefore, a notice of allowance is requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present Request for Reconsideration, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 749-6900, ext. 6914. If any additional fees are due in connection with filing this Request for Reconsideration, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. SUNMP589). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE & PENILLA, L.L.P.



Kenneth D. Wright
Reg. No. 53,795

Martine & Penilla, LLP
710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94086
Tel: (408) 749-6900
Customer Number 32,291